

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 and 38-41 are pending in this application. Of these pending claims, Claims 1-21, 36 and 38-41 stand rejected and claims 22-35 stand withdrawn. By way of this paper, Claims 1 and 15 have been amended; Claims 36 and 38-41 have been canceled; and new Claims 42 and 43 have been added herein.

The foregoing amendments and following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding office action, and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 36 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Tashiro et al. ('863) reference.

Claim 36 has been canceled by way of this paper. As such, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claim 36 is now moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of Claim 36 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-21, and 36-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Jagannathan et al. ('327) reference in view of the Miyashita et al. ('050) reference. Currently pending Claims 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Jagannathan ('327) reference in view of the Miyashita ('050) reference, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Yamazaki et al. ('834) reference. Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tashiro ('863) reference as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of the Miyashita ('050) reference. Claims 36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Jagannathan ('327) reference and the Tashiro ('863) reference in view of each other. Claims 37 and 39-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Jagannathan ('327) reference and the Tashiro ('863) reference in view of each other, as applied to claim 36, and further in view of the Miyashita ('050) reference.

Independent Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to more clearly point out that the material(s) is an electroluminescent material. Support for these amendments can be found on at least page 15, lines 23-29, of Applicants' specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art cited above does not disclose this feature.

In this regard, Applicants submit that the Miyashita ('050) reference discloses a method of manufacturing an organic EL display device in which doping of fluorescent dye induces changes in the maximum wavelength of light absorption in the luminescent layer of the device [0071, 0075]. Therefore, it is possible to manufacture a full color display device emitting the primary colors of red, green, and blue, provided that different fluorescent dyes are used in the manufacturing process [0075, 0077, 0078, 0079]. In this sense, the fluorescent dye is the electroluminescent material because it is the fluorescent dye that controls the maximum wavelength of light absorption in the luminescent layer of the device. However, as disclosed in the Miyashita ('050) reference, different fluorescent dyes must be used to produce the different colors emitted by the device [0077, 0078, 0079]. As such, it can not be said that the Miyashita ('050) reference discloses manufacturing a multi-color display using one electroluminescent material.

In contrast, the present invention uses the same electroluminescent material to produce a display having multiple colors. This is accomplished by varying process parameters or conditions (for example, pressure and/or temperature) either prior to or during delivery of the electroluminescent material (page 15, lines 23-29; page 16, lines 6-10; page 17, lines 4-8 of the specification). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claims 1 and 15 is respectfully requested.

The remainder of the claims being dependent from Claim 1 or Claim 15 are considered patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 36 and 38-41 have been canceled by way of this paper. As such, Applicants submit that the rejection of these claims is now moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claims 36 and 38-41 is respectfully requested.

Additional Claim Amendments


New Claims 42 and 43, each depending from Claim 1, have been added herein. Claim 42 includes the feature of the deposited electroluminescent material associated with the first condition being nanomorphous. Claim 43 includes the feature of the deposited electroluminescent material associated with the second condition being nanomorphous. Support for this amendment can be found on at least page 32, line 29 through page 33, line 6, of Applicants' specification. Applicants submit that the prior art cited above does not disclose the feature of Claim 42 or Claim 43. Accordingly, allowance of Claims 42 and 43 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the above amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance, prompt notice of which is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned in the event that a phone interview will expedite prosecution of this application towards allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


William R. Zimmerli
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 45,287

WRZ/ld
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 588-2758
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.